APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,666	03/31/2004	Richard Francis Cormier	EMC04-05(04034)	5977

58404   7590   11/17/2008
BARRY W. CHAPIN
CHAPIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, LLC
WESTBOROUGH OFFICE PARK
1700 WEST PARK DRIVE, SUITE 280
WESTBOROUGH, MA 01581

EXAMINER
WON, MICHAEL YOUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2455	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Arguments

1.   In response to the argument that Gerard fails to describe "copying current object

data within the current object of the current object model to former object data within an

instantiation of the former object", it is noted that the features upon which applicant

relies (i.e., converts current data to old data) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the

specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26

USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

2.   In response to the argument regarding "receiving a former client request

requiring access to a former object defined by a former object model", Gerard clearly

teaches that each object is identifiable and able to be requested (see office action

citations). Therefore, if a former object currently exists, then Gerard clearly teaches that

the request is a former client request since Gerard teaches sending request messages

for objects (see col.4, lines 1-7). The differences exists because, "former" and "current"

are merely labels. One of ordinary skill in the art can interpret the above limitation to

mean receiving a request in the past for an object in the past wherein which the request

would have been current in the past. One of ordinary skill in the art can also interpret

the above limitation to mean receiving currently a request for a former object wherein

which according to the teachings of Gerard, "former" is merely a label. The examiner

takes the latter position of the interpretation. Therefore, since the recited limitation is

broad such that there are multiple was of interpreting the limitation, the rejection is maintained.

3.   In response to the argument that "former" means "occurring in the past", with respect to Gerard's teachings of "new second", the "first object" of Gerard clearly occurs in the past with respect to the "new second'. Therefore, same logic applies. Furthermore, time is not a patentable limitation since the recited functionality of the invention does not change with respect to time, but merely the data.

4.   In response to the argument regarding backward compatibility, the independent claim as it currently stands does not recite such functionality. The examiner agrees with the argument as indicated in the office action under the heading Allowable Subject Matter. With such explicit functionality, the applicants will expedite patentability.